ಲಿಪಿಗಾರರನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಎಲ್ಲ ಶಾಸಕರೂ ಶೀಘ್ರಲಿಪಿಗಾರರ ಸೇವೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಬ್ಬಿಬ್ಬರು ಉಪಯೋಗ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ತಮಗೆ ಪತ್ರ ಬರೆಯಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಬೇರೆಯವರನ್ನು ರಿಕ್ವೆಸ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಇಂತಹ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶೀಘ್ರಲಿಪಿಗಾರರು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ವಿಧಾನಮಂಡಲ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಾರದೆಂದು ತಾವು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವುದರಿ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಅಧಿಕೃತ ವರದಿಗಾರರು ಏನಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅವರು ಜನವರಿ ೨೭, ೨೮ರಂದು ಅಧಿವೇಶನ ನಡೆಯುವಾಗ ತಮ್ಮ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟು ಮುಷ್ಕರ ಹೂಡಿದ್ದರು ಅದು ದುರಾದೃಷ್ಟಕರ ಅವರ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗಳು ಅತ್ಯರ್ಥವಾಗದೆ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಇವೆಯೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಬಂದಿದೆ. ತಾವು ಕೂಡ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷಗಳ ನಾಯಕರುಗಳನ್ನು ಕರೆಸಿ ಅವರ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸೆಟಲ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅವರು ಪುನಃ ಮುಷ್ಕರ ಮಾಡುವಂತಹ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬರಬಾರದು. ವಿಧಾನಮಂಡಲ ದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಡಿಸ್‌ಪ್ಯುಟ್ ಇದೆ ಅಂದರೆ ಜನ ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ನಂಬುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಧಿಕೃತ ವರದಿಗಾರರ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸೆಟಲ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡಿಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ತಾವು ನನಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ತಮಗೆ ವಂದಿಸಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರಿಂದ ವೈಯಕ್ತಿಕ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ

ಕೆ.ಪಿ.ಸಿ.ಸಿ. (I) ನ ಮಾಜಿ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಚ್. ರಂಗನಾಥ್‌ರವರ ಮೇಲೆ ನಡೆದ ಹಲ್ಲೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಪರು ಉತ್ತರ ನೀಡುವಾಗ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಬಂಗಾರಪ್ಪನವರ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಬಂಗಾರಪ್ಪ :— ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೆ...ಕೆ.ಪಿ.ಸಿ.ಸಿ. (I) ನ ಮಾಜಿ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಚ್. ರಂಗನಾಥ್‌ರವರ ಮೇಲೆ ನಡೆದ ಹಲ್ಲೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನನ್ನ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಾನ್ನೊಂದು ಸ್ವಂತ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ನೀಡ ಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.....

ಶ್ರೀ ರಾಜವರ್ಧನ:—ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಂಕರು ಯಾವ ನಿಯಮದ ಕೆಳಗಡೆ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀಸಾಗರ್.— ನಾನು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತುತ್ತೇನೆ,

ಶ್ರೀ ರಮೇಶ್‌ಕುಮಾರ್.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೆ, ನಾನು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮೊದಲು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಲಿ ಆಮೇಲೆ ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀಸಾಗರ್.—ನಮ್ಮ ನಿಯಮಂಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಾರ. . . . .

Sir, with regard to the Personal Explanation, I would like to quote Rule 317 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business here. It reads thus.—

> "A member with the permission of the Speaker may make a personal explanation although there is no question before the House. But, in this case, no debatable matter may be brought forward and no debate shall arise."

Sir, this rule presup poses that you should decide in the first instance, whether permission for giving personal explanation should be given or not. Secondly, it is also necessary that you should decide, when and how it should be made. These two points are involved here. Sir, if you go back to the procedure that is laid

down in practice that is being followed in Lok Sabha, it may throw a good deal of light on this question. The Rule 315 in Lok Sabha Rules of Procedure on personal explanation is para materia. It is exactly the same. Same language has been used without any difference even in comma and full stop. Therefore, my submission is whatever procedure that is followed in Lok Sabha and whatever convention that has been established in Lok Sabha be followed in this House also. Sir, without transgressing on the time of this House, I would seek your permission to quote here the commentary of Kaul and Shakdher (vide page-341) on the point of Personal Explanation by Members. This is what it says.—

"**Personal Explanation by Members.**—

Members against whom comments or criticisms of a personal nature are made on the floor of the House are entitled to make, with the consent of the Speaker, personal explanations in their defence, although there is no question before the House...

Sir, the same language as is used in rule 315 of the Lok Sabha rules of procedure has been used. Further it reads.—

"...A member has a right to make a personal explanation notwithstanding the fact that the allegations made against him in the House do not relate to him in his capacity as a Member of Parliament but otherwise. The forum of the House should not, however, be used to make personal explanations to contradict or clarify reports, not connected with the proceedings of the House, published in the Press.

Personal explanation may, therefore, be defined as a statement made by a member, with the previous permission of the Speaker, explaining his conduct in regard to a particular question or occasion, replying to an accusation made by another member, or correcting an alleged misrepresentation. Personal explanation is made before the main business of the day is taken up, unless the member in question was permitted by the Speaker to make it during the course of the debate when the allegations against him were made."

Therefore Sir, under the rule your permission is necessary and after you choose to give permission, you should also fix up the time and the manner of making personal explanation. The Personal Explanation is to be made before the main business of the day is taken up, Sir, further it is observed thus.—

"Normally, if a member during the course of debate makes any allegations in the House against another member or a Minister without giving advance notice thereof to the speaker as required under the rule on the subject, the member, is called to order. However, where any such allegations have gone on record, the Minister or the member against whom allegations have been made is allowed on his request, to make a personal explanation in the House with a view to clarifying the position either on the same day or later on.

When the member is present in the House at the time of the allegations are made, he is normally permitted to make a statement by way of personal explanation at the end of the speech of the member who makes the allegations or, if the latter gives way, immediatelly after the allegations are made. But he cannot make a long personal explanation in the midst of a speech, for that, he must seek permission and raise the matter separately.

When the member in question does not wish to make a personal explanation on the spot or if he is not present at that time in the House, he is allowed to make a statement later on.

Now, there are two possibilities here, when the matter about which personal explanation is sought to be made by a member, when he is not present in the House and when he is present in the House. When he is present, he may be permitted to make a short personal explanation.

"In this case, the Member seeking permission for a personal explanation either places personally the facts before the Speaker in his Chamber or makes a written request to him enclosing a copy of the statement to be made by him by way of proposed explanation or a gist there of. The advance copy of the statement is examined with a view to seeing that it is brief and concise and does not introduce any further controversial or debatable matter. If any portion there-of is considered objectionable or beyond the scope of personal explanation, the member is asked to delete it, before permission to make the statement is granted. The copy is to be submitted to the Speaker sufficiently in advance, for his approval."

Sir, in this particular case, the Hon'ble Leader of the opposition was not present when the Hon'ble Home Minister made the statement.

So, it is open to the Hon'ble Leaders of the Opposition to approach you in your chamber and personally place the facts before you in your chamber or to make a written request to you enclosing a copy of the statement to be made by him, by way of explanation This is the position. My submission is that what is followed in Loka Sabha as is evidenced from this paragraph is proper and necessary procedure that should be followed by you. Sir, I further quote.

> "If the permission has been granted, the member makes the statement in the House on the date and time fixed by the Speaker, and the Minister or the member who is alleged to have made the charges is accordingly imformed as to when the statement would be made."

So, that should be done.

> "After the personal explanation has been made, no further questions are allowed on it, if the allegations are denied on the floor of the House, the denial is normally accepted by the member who made the allegations, even if the latter is not satisfied with the personal explanation, no further statement is allowed, the idea being not to convert it into a debate. When a personal explanation is made by a Member, it is not the practice to allow another Member to make a counter-explanation. The matter is treated as closed with the statements of both sides being on record..."

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY,—Sir, his Point of Order cannot be irrelevant.

MR, SPEAKER.—Let us see whether there is relevance .

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY.—If you are allowing him to read the entire Book of Parliamentary Practice and Procedure, I have no objection. But the Point of Order, which is irrelevant cannot be raised.

MR. SPEAKER.—Let us hear him.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ವೀರಪ್ಪ ಮೊಯ್ಲಿ —ಅವರು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಕ್ಕು ಇದೆ. ಎತ್ತಲಿ. ಆದರೆ ಪರ್ಸನಲ್ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪ್ಲನೇಷನ್ ಕೊಡುವುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತುವುದೆ ಪರ್ಸನಲ್ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪ್ಲನೇಷನ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಮೇಲೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸಭೆ ನಿರ್ಣಯಿಸುತ್ತದೆ.

SRI A LAKSHMISAGAR.—Sir, that is his opinion. I am entitled to my opinion. He is entitled to say it is irrelevant. I am equally

entitled to contend that it is most relevant under the circumstances in which we are considering the matter of personal explanation by the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition. Hon'ble Speaker will decide the matter as to which is relevant and which is not relevant. We are considering the ambit of the personal explanation that is sought to be made by the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition. Let us understand the whole gamut of it. Nobody is running away. What is given to you is also given to me. I further quote.

> "However, after the personal explanation by a member the Speaker may, in appropriate cases, permit the Minister or the member concerned to make a clarificatory statement for which also the submission of an advance copy is necessary."

Sir, submission of an advance copy is also necessary in a situation like this.

> "In cases where certain allegations were made in the other House against a member of Lok Sabha the Speaker has permitted the affected member to make a personal explanation in the House to clarify his position. The Speaker has also permitted members whose names were mentioned in the other House in connection with a certain inquiry being conducted by the Government, to make personal explanations in theHouse to clarify their respective positions.
>
> Where allegations are made in the House against a particular political party the leader of that party or group in the House is permitted to make a statement in regard thereto. He has however, to submit to the Speaker, the text of the statment to be made by him, and he can make the statment only if the Speaker accords him the permission after going through the statment.
>
> When the conduct of a member, whether inside the House or outsideit has been mentioned in, and becomes the subject matter of a, Report which is land on the Table of the House, he may be permitted to make a personal explanation to clarify his position. A Member may also be permitted to make a personal explanation if the statement to which objection is take ncan be attributed to him.

Personal explanation can be made onle by the member against whom any charges or allegations have been made during the course of the dabate in the House, no other member can make an explanation on be half of that member.

A Member who desires to make a personal explanation should do so at the earliest opportunity, he should restrict himself to the particular matter and not seek to reply to the debate or the criticism of a general nature levelled against him, a personal explanation cannot be utilised for making another speech, personal explanation with regard to a matter under adjudication eventhough, a Minister has referred to it in the House, is not permissible, if a member quotes an extract in refutation of another member's argument, it is not a personal explanation, it is also not permissible to make a personal explanation with respect to every small matter. On a personal explanation, a member is not in order in explaining his reasons for not voting on a particular matter. "

These are the parametares within personal explanation can be permitted to be made by you in this House.. Kindly pardon me for saying this. Whether the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition has sent to you an advance copy of the personal explanation which he wishes to make now before this House ? If he has sent, have you had the opportunity of going through it for satisfying yourself whether or not that statement contains debatable or questionable matter ? If it is so, you are at liberty to delete those portions, as pointed out by the decisions of Lokasabha. Therefore my submission to you is that there must be written statement. It may be possible that the other side may contend that in this House there has been no practise of making a wirtten a personal explanation to the Speaker with an Advance copy and therefore an oral statment may be permitted to be made explaining the personal matter in regard to a particular allegation, alleged to have been made Therefore, my submission is that we have got to set up the precedents. I am not quoting from the Parliamentary Practice. This is the practice that has grown over since 1932 and this practice have been codified and found a place in a treatise which is invaluable in its content and character namely the treatise of Kaul and Shakder, we should necessarily follow is my submission.

5-30 P.M.

We should necessarily follow. This is my submission. Therefore, the last two sentences:

> "Portions of personal explanation held to be objectionable have been expunged. Words, phrases and expressions which are not in the statement approved by the Speaker, if spoken, do not form part of the proceedings of the House."

So these are the parameters within which a personal explanation has to be made. I am sorry that the hon. Member Sri Moily did not have time to go through the entire matter relating to this as contained in Kaul & Shakdhar. I am not trying to take away Opposition Members' right. All I am trying to submit to the speaker is what has been followed in the Lok Sabha. Though the rule is silent in so many other aspects which have come up now, are found in Kaul and Shakdhar. We have to consider, as a matter of follow-up action, what your Office yesterday has issued in the form of a Bulletin. I will seek your permission to read out it.

Sub.- **Personal explanation by the Members in the House- Directions by the Speaker-procedure regarding.**

"Attention of the Hon'ble Members in invited to rule 315 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of the Business in the Legislative Assembly which provides for making a personal explanation by a Member in the House. In this connection, the Hon'ble Speaker has laid down the following procedure to be followed by the Members while making personal explanation under the said rule;

"Members against whom comments or criticisms of a personal nature are made on the floor of the House are entitled to make with the consent of the Speaker, a personal explanation. Such statement shall be brief and concise and shall not introduce any controversial or debatable matter.

"When the Member is present in the House at the time the allegations are made against him, he will be permitted to make a statement by way of personal explanation at the end of the speech of the Member/Minister who made the allegations.

"When the Member is not present in the House at the time the allegations are made and desiring to avail the provision shall make a written request to the Speaker enclosing a copy of the statement of personal explanation